

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TANYA OWENS, et al.,
Plaintiff(s),

v.

MGM RESORTS INTERNATIONAL,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:23-cv-01480-GMN-NJK

Order

[Docket No. 80]

Plaintiffs are seeking the deposition of, and documents from, class member Gregory Price on June 13, 2025. *See* Docket No. 79. Price filed a number of documents, including a document the Court construes as a motion to quash and for protective order. *See* Docket No. 80.¹ Plaintiffs must file a response by 10:00 a.m. on June 12, 2025. In addition to addressing the motion generally, Plaintiffs must specifically address whether the motion to quash is properly decided in this Court, as opposed to the Eastern District of Michigan. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(d)(3)(A) (requiring action by “the court for the district where compliance is required”); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(c) (defining place of compliance). Plaintiffs must also specifically explain why, if they contend Price is properly treated as a party for discovery purposes, documents can be sought through a notice with roughly two weeks to respond rather than through a properly propounded request for production with 30 days to respond. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 11, 2025



Nancy J. Koppe
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants. *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007).